



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,913	03/09/2001	Kesatoshi Takeuchi	204155US2	2612

22850 7590 11/17/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

WANG, JIN CHENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

13

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/801,913

Applicant(s)

TAKEUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Jin-Cheng Wang

Art Unit

2672

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-23

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

1) Applicant argues in essence with respect to the amended claim 1 and similar claims that Glen does not teach or suggest "a plurality of resolution converters configured to receive respective outputs of the image selector DIRECTLY from the image selector such that any resolution converter can receive any output of the image selector". In response, the examiner asserts that Glen teaches the claim limitation because Glen teaches a plurality of resolution converters (e.g., the resolution converting functions (see column 8, lines 45-60) are performed in the blending module and the blending module 48 and 50 of figure 2 is similar to the programmable blending module 116 performing resolution conversion function. See also figures 7-8, column 8, lines 45-60) configured to receive respective outputs of the image selector (since applicant has amended the claim 1 and similar claims, the Final Rejection set forth in the previously Office Action needs to be modified here, now the configuration module 40 combined with the multiplexors of figures 2 meet the claim limitation of the image selector since the claim has been amended to recite "outputs of the image selector directly from the image selector"; see also column 3, lines 35-67; column 4, lines 1-55) such that any resolution converter (any of the blending modules) can receive any output of the image selector (e.g., any output from the combined unit of the configuration module 40 and multiplexors of figure 2).

2) Applicant argues in essence with respect to the amended claim 1 and similar claims that Glen does not teach or suggest "the resolution converters output the converted image signals to the image synthesizer". In response, the examiner asserts that this new limitation has not distinguished the claim 1 from the prior art of record because Glen discloses the blending modules performing both the resolution converting and the image synthesizing. It would have been obvious to separate the functionality of the blending module of Glen into the two separate blocks of the resolution converter and the image synthesizer within the blending modules because the two blocks can be performed in sequel. One of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do this because resolution conversion can be performed prior to the image blending.

Therefore, Glen fulfills the amended claim 1 as currently drafted.



MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600